Atty. Dkt. No. 02CR360/KE (047141-0311)

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present Application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1-4 are currently being amended. Claims 7-16 were previously withdrawn. Claims 7-16 are being cancelled without prejudice. Applicants expressly reserve the right to file a divisional application on the subject matter of Claims 7-16. No new claims are being added. After amending the claims as set forth above, Claims 1-6 and 17-20 are now pending in this Application.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this Application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the Application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the Application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

For simplicity and clarity purposes in responding to the Office Action, Applicants' remarks are primarily focused on the rejections of the independent claims (i.e. 1 and 17) outlined in the Office Action with the understanding that the dependent claims that depend from the independent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons (and in most cases other reasons) that the independent claims are patentable. Applicants expressly reserve the right to argue the patentability of the dependent claims separately in any future proceedings.

35 U.S.C. § 112

On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, Claims 1-6 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. The Office Action stated:

-7-

Atty. Dkt. No. 02CR360/KE (047141-0311)

As per claims 1-6 and 17-20, the term 'input/output is recited throughout the claims. It is unclear what the metes and the bounds of the claim pertain to, as the '/' could either mean 'and' or 'or'.

Claims 1 and 3, which recited input/output have been amended to include the terms input or output. This amended was for clarity and not for patentability.

The Office Action further stated:

As per claim 18, the claim recites wherein the processors comprise red processing devices. It is unclear what 'red' refers to, as it is not detailed in the specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that the red processor is conveyed with reasonable clarity to one skilled in the relevant art by Paragraph [0024], which states:

A detailed block diagram of the Network INFOSEC Unit (NIU) is shown in FIG. 2. The NIU provides all of the red JTR functionality as well as the black side crypto, black switch, black JTR-JTR and remote CDD functionality. High Assurance Mux (HAMUX) elements are highlighted in the figure and are elements in which at least some of the inventive concepts may be applied.

Applicants respectfully submit that the red processor is further conveyed with reasonable clarity to one skilled in the relevant art by Paragraphs [0026, 0054, 0055] and figures 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

The Office Action also stated:

As per claim 20, the claim recites wherein the processors comprise black processing devices. It is unclear what 'black' refers to, as it is not detailed in the specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that the black processor is conveyed with reasonable clarity to one skilled in the relevant art by Paragraph [0025], which states:

A detailed block diagram of the Network INFOSEC Unit (NIU) is shown in FIG. 2. The NIU provides all of the red JTR functionality as well as the black side crypto, black switch, black JTR-JTR and remote CDD functionality. High

-8-

Atty. Dkt. No. 02CR360/KE (047141-0311)

Assurance Mux (HAMUX) elements are highlighted in the figure and are elements in which at least some of the inventive concepts may be applied.

Applicants respectfully submit that the black processor is further conveyed with reasonable clarity to one skilled in the relevant art by Paragraph [0053] and figures 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-6 and 17-20 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102

On pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 17, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0052372 ("Jakoubek"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants have concurrently with this Amendment and Reply submitted a Correction of Inventorship in a Patent Application under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48 for this application, a Correction of Inventorship in a Patent Application under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48 for Jakoubek and a Petition to Accept an Unintentionally Delayed Priority Claim under 37 C.F.R. § 1.78(a). The Petition to Accept an Unintentionally Delayed Priority Claim under 37 C.F.R. § 1.78(a) states that priority of this application should be corrected to include Jakoubek. Therefore, Jakoubek cannot be utilized as a reference to reject Claims 1-3, 17, 18, and 20.

Accordingly, Claims 1-3, 17, 18, and 20 are not anticipated by Jakoubek. The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-3, 17, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

35 U.S.C. § 103

On pages 5-7 of the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 17, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,944,475 ("Campbell"); in view of U.S.

-9-

Patent No. 5,991,642 ("Watanabe"); and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,101,255 ("Harrison"). Applicants note that the Harrison reference is cited because Harrison was utilized by the Examiner to reject dependent Claim 4. The limitations in dependent Claim 4 are now recited in amended Claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that these references, alone or in combination, do not render obvious that which is recited in amended Claims 1 and 17.

Campbell relates to a "transceiver-processor building block (700) for implementation of radio systems." (Campbell, Abstract). Watanabe relates to a "mobile communication system having a control station which selects speech coding schemes for a mobile station." (Watanabe, Title). Harrison relates to a "programming cryptographic processing system and method." (Harrison, Title).

Campbell in combination with Watanabe and/or Harrison would not have resulted in the subject matter recited in amended independent Claim 1 because the proposed modification of Campbell in combination with Watanabe and/or Harrison does not disclose, teach, or suggest a "multi-channel radio ... wherein the second common bus directs an encoded information so that it is received by an intended processor of the second set of more than one processors and not received or understood by another processor of the second set of more than one processors."

Campbell in combination with Watanabe and/or Harrison would not have resulted in the subject matter recited in independent Claim 17 because the proposed modification of Campbell in combination with Watanabe and/or Harrison does not disclose, teach, or suggest a "multi-channel radio ... and a common bus interface coupled between the first set of processors and the second set of processors, the interface configured to isolate processors of the second set of processors from one another based on the information security level."

The Examiner stated "Claim 17 is rejected using the same basis of arguments used to reject Claim 1." The Examiner stated "the Campbell combination does not teach explicitly wherein the second common bus directs the encoded information so that it is received by the

-10-

intended processor of the second set of processors and not received or understood by other of the processors of the second set of processors. However, this is taught by Harrison in col. 5 line 55 to col. 6 line 17."

Harrison in col. 5 line 55 to col. 6 line 17 states:

> In reference to FIG. 2, data units 41 are transferred from an external host to one of interface processors 13 or 15 (FIG. 1), shown as time-line 40 ... Preferably, only a portion of the data unit is transferred to the processing engine, for example, everything but the header ... Time-line 44 shows the time period in which a processing engine is processing data unit 45 and transferring the processed data portions to the output interface processor.

Harrison does not appear to disclose, teach, or suggest a "multi-channel radio ... the second common bus directs an encoded information so that it is received by an intended processor of the second set of more than one processors and not received or understood by another processor of the second set of more than one processors." Applicants submit that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* basis to deny patentability to the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. §103. The Examiner has failed the requisite factual basis because the rejection does not comply with the all claim limitations standard under 35 U.S.C. §103. None of the cited references, alone or in proper combination, disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter recited in independent Claims 1 and 17, as amended.

Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter recited in independent Claims 1 and 17 are not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) by these cited references. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-3, 17, 18, and 20.

On pages 7-10 of the Office Action, Claims 4, 5, 6, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Campbell; in view of Watanabe; in view of Harrison; in view of U.S. SIR Reg. No. H1,836 ("Fletcher"); and in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,960,344 ("Mahany"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that these

-11-

references, alone or in combination, do not render obvious that which is recited in Claims 4, 5, 6, and 19.

Claim 4, 5, and 6 depend from Claim 1 and include all of the limitations thereof. Claim 19 depends from Claim 17 and includes all of the limitations thereof. Fletcher and/or Mahany do not cure the deficiencies of Campbell, Watanabe and/or Harrison noted above with reference to Claims 1 and 17. Therefore, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 4, 5, 6 and 19.

*   *   *

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Further, Applicants respectfully put the Patent Office and all others on notice that all arguments, representations, and/or amendments contained herein are only applicable to the present Application and should not be considered when evaluating any other patent or patent application including any patents or patent applications which claim priority to this patent Application and/or any patents or patent applications to which priority is claimed by this patent Application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 18-1722. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of

-12-

Atty. Dkt. No. 02CR360/KE (047141-0311)

papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136
and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 18-1722.

Respectfully submitted,

Date ___11/5/2007___   By ___Kyle Eppele___

ROCKWELL COLLINS, INC.   Kyle Eppele
400 Collins Road, NE   Attorney for Applicants
Cedar Rapids, IA 52498   Registration No. 34,155
Telephone: (319) 295-8280
Facsimile: (319) 295-8777
Customer No. 26383

-13-

MILW_2679354.1

PAGE 39/39 * RCVD AT 11/5/2007 12:01:51 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-2/22 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:319 295 8777 * DURATION (mm-ss):10-58   P.39